THE PAEDO-BAPTISTS APOLOGY POLOGY FOR THE BAPTIZED CHURCHES

THOMAS GRANTHAM

The
Paedo-Baptists Apology
For The
Baptized Churches

Shewing
The invalidity of the strongest arguments for infant baptism, out of the works of the learned defenders of that tenet.

And

That the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins is a duty required of all sinners who come orderly to the profession of Christianity.

Also

The Promise of the Spirit
Being the substance of a Sermon on 1 Corinthians 12:1.
To which is added

A Post-Script.

Out of the works of Dr. Jeremy Taylor in defense of the laying on of hands as a never failing ministry.

By Thomas Grantham

Mr. William Perkins on Galatians 3:27:
Baptism alone is no sign of being God's child; rather, it is baptism joined with faith, for that is how the scripture must be understood. All the Galatians who believe are baptized into Christ.

Printed in the Year. 1671.

To the Reader.

Friend,

I Have a few things to say before thou read this ensuing Apology, and first,

The occasion of it is from the late unkind usages which the Baptized Churches have received from the Paedo-Baptists, by violently dispersing their Assemblies, by defacing and taking away their meeting places, by imprisoning their persons, seizing and wasting their Estates, by injuring them in their Trade by means of excommunications, by Writs de Capiendo and other penal proceedings both confining their Persons and exposing them to great inconveniencies. And all this only (as I conceive for their conscionable observance of the will of God in Preaching the Gospel to sinners for the obedience of faith, and for adhering to that form of Doctrine once delivered to the Saints Hebrews 6.

1. In which Doctrine and sufferings being through the mercy of God a pertaker with them, I thought I might lawfully write an Apology for them, or at least for the Truth professed by them. And that I might the more effectually do this, I chose to speak to their adversaries by the learned Pens of their own Doctors.
2. My design in writing this Apology, is to abate (if it may be) that great enmity which hath appeared generally between the parties concerned; and more particularly that spirit of opposition and disrespect which too much appears in the more refined sort of the Paedo-Baptists, against such as labor to reform (or rather to restore) the Doctrine of Baptism, to its first integrity and estimation among all that profess the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, under what Epethits or denominations soever. And me thinks the truth should prevail with all that do consider the authority and force thereof to be such that men are constrained (as it were to speak for it though to the overthrow of their dearest errors, so that we may say their Rock is not as our Rock, our enemies being judges.
3. I have not injured the sense of my authors, and where I have added any thing for explication of any word or passage, I have distinguished the same partly by a different Letter, and partly by this Character, nor have I said much in the Apology, as indeed it was not necessary, considering the evidence of the word of God for us, and the Record which our opposers do bear in favour of our Cause; and beside they that will may see what may be further said in the case depending, if they please to peruse the Learned works of those those of our way, viz. Denn his

Answer to Dr. Featley, Tombs, his Antipaedo-Baptist, Fisher, his Christianismus Redivivous, and many others.

4. The second part entitled Of the Promise of the Spirit, I thought fit to be annexed, because Acts 2:38-39. such as are Baptized with the Baptism of Repentance for Remission of sins, have the promise of the Spirit made to them, which being sought for in the way ordained of God, shall be received according to his will for he is faithful that promised.

Thy Servant in Christ,

Tho. Grantham.

The
Paedo-Baptists Apology
For
The Baptized Churches

There is no point of the Christian Faith, of greater importance in order to the composure of Divisions among such as conscientiously profess the Name of Christ, then the Doctrine of holy Baptism, in the Name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins; for As many as have been (Galatians. 3:27) Baptized into Christ (Hebrews. 6:2) have put on Christ. And where this foundation truth hath been neglected or essentially corrupted, There hath ensued great disorder in Religion, because the being of the Church (as visible) is so concerned therein that there can be no orderly proceeding in any Church Act, nor participation in any Church Privilege, where Sacred Baptism is not Antecedent.

And though Reformation (or rather the restoration) of this Truth be hard to accomplish, yet must we not be
discouraged, but still pursue all lawful and probable ways to effect it in this, as well as in other cases. And the way which I have chosen to help on this needful work at this time is to shew, that (notwithstanding the discord in point of practice) yet there is a very great concord in doctrine touching the main questions which
concern this Heavenly Institution, between the Paedo-Baptists, and the Baptized Churches. The questions are these.

1. What are the Qualifications required of all such as are to be baptized.
2. What is the due Act or right Form to be observed and done in this solemnity of Baptism.

Touching the first, the doctrine of the Baptized Churches is well known, namely, that repentance toward God, and faith towards our Lord Jesus Christ are prerequisites to the baptism of every sinner. And to this agrees the holy Scripture with full consent, saying, Repent and be baptized every one of you. (Acts. 2:38) They were all baptized (Mark. 1:5) confessing their sins. (Acts. 8:12) When they believed Philip preaching the things (Acts. 18:8) concerning the Kingdome of God &c. They were baptized both men and women, many of the Corinthians hearing, believed and were baptized. And hence this holy Ordinance is well called the Laver of Regeneration; the Baptisme of repentance, for the remission of sins. Now let us hear the doctrine of the Paedo-Baptists touching this question.

1. The Church of England both in her Articles and vulgar Catechism, delivers her mind clearly to this purpose, that such repentance whereby sin is forsaken, and such Faith as by which the promises of God are steadfastly believed, is required of persons (meaning all persons) which are to be baptized, and that in Baptism Faith is confirmed &c.
2. Mr. Perkins) a Learned Son of the same Church upon these words, *Teach all Nations baptizing them.* faith, I explain the words thus, mark, first of all it is said Teach them; that is make them my Disciples by calling them to believe, and to repent. Here we are to consider, the order which God observes in making with man the Covenant in Baptism, first of all he calls them by his word and commands them to believe and repent, then in the second place God makes his promise of mercy and forgiveness; and thirdly he seals his promise by Baptism—they that know not, nor consider this order which God used in Covenanting with them in Baptism, deal preposterously, overslipping the commandment of repenting and believing—this is the cause of of so much profaneness in the world—we see what is done in Baptism, the Covenant of grace is solemnized between God and the Party baptized, and in this Covenant some things belongs to God, some to the Party baptized—the actions of the Party baptized is a certain stipulation, or obligation, whereby he bindeth himself to give homage to the Father, Son, and holy Ghost. This homage standeth IN FAITH, whereby all the promises of God are believed, and in OBEDIENCE to all his commandements. The sign of this obligation, is that the Party baptized WILLINGLY yields himself to be washed with water.
3. Giovanni Diodati, on the same text, teaches that Baptism is a Sacrament of grace in remission and expiation of sins, and regeneration to a new life. And likewise for a token that they are bound on their side (meaning such as are baptized) to consecrate themselves to God, and to give themselves over to the conduct of his Spirit, and to CONFESS his name PERPETUALLY. Thus these three witnesses do concur with the truth and therein do hold a concord with the baptized Churches, And one would think there should now be no place for such a conceit, as that Infants are fit subjects for the sacred ordinance of baptism, because wholly incapable of these qualifications. Now whereas diverse things are pretended as grounds for Infant Baptism, we shall briefly recount the particulars which are chiefly insisted on, and then show how the same are refuted or made void by

some of the most learned Asserters of Paedo-baptism. The grounds pretended are these.

1. The Covenant which God made with Abraham and his seed, (Genesis. 17) who were to be circumcised (to wit the males only) in their Infancy, this is thought to be a Type of baptism, and hence 'tis conceived that Infants ought to be baptized.
2. Christs permitting Infants to be brought to him, as persons to whom the Kingdome belongs.
3. They, being tainted with original sin, must be cleansed from it, which is supposed to be done by baptism.
4. Because it is said except a man be born of water &c. he cannot enter into the kingdom of God. (John. 3)
5. Because Infants do not ponere obicem, and so are more fit for baptism then adult Persons, as 'tis thought.
6. Because without baptism parents can not hope the salvation of dying infants (as some think.)
7. The promise of the holy Ghost, (Acts. 2:39) is thought to belong to Infants, and so they ought to be baptized because they are said to be holy.
8. Unless Infants be baptized 'tis thought God is worse to Infants in the Gospel, then in the Law.
9. Infants are a part of all Nations, and the command for baptizing is of extent to all Nations.
10. 'Tis thought the Apostles baptized Infants because they baptized whole households, and 'tis said, it hath descended to this very age as a Tradition Apostolical.

To all which, Doct. Jer. Taylor *(and others) in behalf of the baptized Churches, do give answer as followeth (The Liberty of Prophesying. pag. 228-246.)*

That this is a goodly Harangue, which upon strict examination will come to nothing; that it pretends fairly, and signifies little; that some of those allegations are false, some impertinent, and all the rest insufficient. For the argument from circumcision, is invalid (*or, of no weight*) upon infinite considerations, figures and types proves nothing, unless, a commandment go along with them, or some express to signifie such to be their purpose: for the deluge of waters and the ark of Noah were a figure of Baptism said Peter: and if therefore the Circumstances of one should be drawn to the other, we should make

Baptism a Prodigie, rather there then a rite. The Pascal Lamb was a Type of the Eucharist which succeeds the other as Baptism doth Circumcision, but because there was in the manducation of the Pascal Lamb, no prescription of Sacramental drink, shall we thence conclude that the Eucharist is to be ministered but in one kind? and even in the very instance of this argument, supposing a correspondence of analogy between Circumcision and Baptism, (*Which yet the Baptists do not grant*) yet there is no correspondence of Identity: for although it were granted that both of them did consign the Covenant of Faith, yet there is nothing in Circumstance of Childrens being Circumcised that so concerns that Mystery; but that it might very well be given to Children, and yet Baptism to men of reason; because Circumcision left a Character in the flesh, which being imprinted upon Infants did its work to them when they came to age, and such a Character was necessary, because there was no word added to the sign; but baptism imprints nothing that remains on the body, and if it leaves a Character at all it is upon the soul to which also the word is added, which is as much a part of the Sacrament as the sign itself is (*It is a saying of Augustine,* De trahe verbum quid est aqua &c. *Take away the word and what is water, nothing but water joins the word to the Element and it is made a Sacrament. This consideration is very concluding as against Paedo-Baptism, for to the Infant, the word is as it were taken away from the Element, and consequently according to Augustine. it can be no Sacrament to them at all.*)for both which reasons it is very requisite that the Persons baptized should be capable of reason, that they may be capable of both the word of the Sacrament and the impress made upon the Spirit. Since therefore the reason of this parity does wholly fail, there is nothing left to infer a necessity, of complying in this circumstance of age, any more than in the other annexes of the Type: and the case is clear in the Bishops question to Cyprian, why should not Infants be baptized just upon the eight day as well as Circumcised, if the correspondence of the rites be an argument, for one circumstance which is impertinent, and accidental to the mysteriousness of the rite, why should it not infer all [especially such a material thing as the time of baptism, for if the eight day be not determined, no man is able to assign the day of baptism, which being delayed till the tenth or twentieth day may by the same reason be deferred till the Child have passed through its infancy, and become capable of erudition] and then also females must not be baptized because they were not circumcised, but it were more proper, if we would understand it aright, to prosecute the analogy of the type to the antitype by way of letter and spirit, and signification, and as circumcision signifies baptism so also the adjuncts of circumcision shall signifie something spiritual in the adherences of baptism. And therefore as Infants were circumcised, so spiritual Infants shall be baptized, which (according to some) is

spiritual circumcision [which yet is better expounded by St. Paul, (Philippians. 3) Where he makes the spiritual circumcision to be the mind and spirit renewed, and the putting of the body of the sins of the flesh] for therefore babes had the ministery of the type to signifie that we must when we give our names to Christ, become νηπιοι εν πονηρια Children in malice, [for unless you become like one of these little ones you cannot enter into the Kingdome of Heaven] said our Blessed Saviour, and then the tie is made compleat, and this seems to have been the scene of the primitive Church, for in the ages next to the Apostles, they gave to all baptized persons milk and honey to represent to them their duty, that though in age and understanding they were men, yet they were babes in Christ, and Children in malice. But to infer the sense of the Paedo-Baptists, is so weak a manner of arguing, that *Augustine* whose device it was (and men use to be in love with their own fancies) at the most pretended it but as probable [*Lo here the newness of the argument, from Infant circumcision, to Infant baptism.*]

[As for the Catholics they hold it an absurd thing to argue as the Protestants do, from the Covenant made with Abraham and his seed, (Genesis. 17:7) Thus they speak, (from the hand of controversy. under the probation of the verse of their Doctors, Professors and Students in Theology. p. 372-377.) *that promises concerns literally peculiar productions, and worldly felicity, nor liberation of sins and everlasting Life, neither can we be sons of Abraham by carnal generation, or by our carnal Parents; we are not Jews but Gentiles) but only by spiritual generation (to wit Baptism) by which we are born to God, and made the brethren of Christ, the Sons of Abraham, those (saith St. Paul) are the sons of Abraham, not who are the Sons of the flesh but of Faith* (Romans. 4:12-13)

Again they deride the Argument drawing from Infants not being circumcised in order to their being baptized, calling it *a cunning argument by which it will follow that Females are not to be baptized, &c.*

And as if successfully they have with the other Arguments as with this for from the action of Christs blessing Infants to infer that they are to be baptized, proves nothing so much as that there is a great want of better arguments. The Conclusion would be with more probability derived thus; Christ blessed Children and so dismissed them, but baptized them not, therefore Infants are not to be baptized; but let this be as weak as its enemy, yet that Christ did not baptize them, is an argument sufficient that Christ hath other ways of bringing them to Heaven. He passed his act of Grace upon them by benediction and imposition of hands.

And therefore though neither Infants nor any man in *puris naturalibus* can attain to a supernatural end without the addition of some instrument or means of Gods appointing ordinarily, yet where God hath not appointed a rule nor an order, as in the case of

Infants, we contend he hath not, this argument is invalid. And as we are sure that God hath not commanded Infants to be baptized, so we are sure God will do them no injuries, nor damn them for what they cannot help.

And therefore let them be pressed with all the inconveniences which are consequent to Original sin, yet either it will not be laid to their charge, so as to be sufficient to condemn them, or if it could, yet the mercy and absolute goodness of God will secure them, He takes them away before they can glorify him by a free obedience. *Quid ergo festinat innocens alis ad remissionem peccatorum?* Was the question of *Tertullian* (On Baptism) he knew no such danger from their Original guilt, as to drive them to a laver of which in that age of innocence they had no need, as he conceived; and therefore there is no necessity of flying to the help of others, for tongues, and bears, and faith, & predispositions to baptism; for what need all this stir? as Infants without their own consent, without any act of their own, and without any exterior solemnity, contracted the guilt of Adam's sin, and are liable to all the punishment which can with Justice descend upon his posterity who are personally innocent; so, Infants shall be restored without any solemnity or act of their own, or any of their for them, by the second Adam by the redemption of Jesus Christ by his righteousness and mercies, applied either immediately, or how, or when he please, to appoint [*and to this agrees this saying of the Apostle as in Adam all die, so in Christ shall all be made alive; and as by the disobedience of one many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous.*] And so Austin's argument will come to nothing without any need of God-fathers, or the faith of anybody else. And it is too narrow a conception of God Almighty, because he hath tyed us to the observation of Ceremonies of his own institution, that therefore he hath tyed himself to it. Many thousand ways there are by which God can bring any reasonable soul to himself: but nothing is more unreasonable, then because he hath tyed all men of years and discretion to this way, therefore we of our own heads shall carry Infants to him that way without his direction: the conceit is poor and low, and the action consequent to it, is too bold and venturous, *mysterium meum mihi & filiis domus meæ.* Let him do what he pleases. To Infants we must not.

Only this is certain, that God hath as great care of Infants as of others, and because they have no capacity of doing such acts, as may be in order to acquiring salvation, God will by his own immediate mercy bring them thither, where he hath intended them; but to say that therefore he will do it by an external act and ministry, and that confin'd to a particular, viz. This rite & no other, is no good argument unless God could not do it without such means, or that he had said he would not: and why cannot God as well do his mercies to Infants now immediately, as he did before the Institution either of

Circumcision or Baptism? [*This query is worthy of serious consideration*] however there is no danger that Infants should perish for want of this external Ministry, much less, for prevaricating Christs precept, nisi quis renatus fuerit &c. For first the water and spirit in this place [*according to some learned expositers*] signifie the same thing: and by water is meant the effect of the spirit cleansing and purifying the soul, as appears in its parallel place, of Christs baptizing with the holy Ghost and Fire — (but to let pass this advantage and to suppose it to be meant of external Baptism [*as that is the most likely sense*] yet this no more infers a necessity of Infants Baptism, then the other words of Christ infer a necessity to give them the holy Communion, *nisi manducaveritis carnem filii hominis,* & *biberitis sanguinem non intrabitis in regnum cœlorum*; and yet we do not think these words sufficient Argument to communicate them; if men therefore will do us justice, either let them give both Sacraments to Infants as some Ages of the Church did, or neither; for the wit of man is not able to shew a disparity in the sanction, or in the everse of its expression; and therefore they were honest, that understood the obligation to be parrallel, and performed it accordingly, and yet because we say they were deceived in one instance, and yet the obligation (all the world cannot reasonably say but) is the same: they are as honest and as reasonable that do neither. And since the ancient Church did with an equal opinion of necessity give them Communion, and yet men nowadays do not, why shall men be more burthened with a prejudice and name of obloquy for not giving the Infants one Sacrament, more then they are disliked for not affording them the other. If Anabaptist shall be a name of disgrace, why shall not some other name be invented for them that deny to communicate Infants, which shall be equally disgraceful, or else both the Opinions signified by such names, be accounted no disparagement, but receive their estimate according to their truth: Of which truth since we are now taking account from pretences of Scripture, it is considerable the discourse of *St. Peter,* which is pretended for the entitling Infants to the promise of the holy Ghost, and by consequence to Baptism, which is supposed to be its instrument of conveyance, 'tis wholly a fancy, and hath nothing in it of certainty or demonstration and not much probability. For besides that the thing it self is unreasonable and the holy Ghost works by the heighting and improving our natural faculties, and therefore is a promise that so concerns them, as they are reasonable Creatures, and may have a tittle to it, in proportion to their nature, but no possession or reception of it, till their faculties come into act, besides this, I say, the words mentioned in S. Peter's sermon (which are the only record of the promise) are interpreted upon a wise mistake; the promise belongs to you and to your Children therefore Infants are actually receptive of it in that capacity, that's the argument: but the reason of it is not yet discovered nor never will [*For indeed it is without reason*] *To you*

and your Children, is you and your posterity, to you and your children when they are of the same capacity in which you are effectually receptive of the promise. [*Beside the promise of the Spirit in this place is referred to the gifts of the holy Ghost, and is therefore made to those who had already received it in the quickening, or illuminating operation of it, and is the portion of believers as such, and is consequent to baptism.* (Acts. 2:38-39) *and is therefore wrongfully made an argument for the baptizing of Infants, who (whatever they may have of the graces of the spirit (a thing wholly unknown that they have any such receipt of the Spirit.) yet) have neither need of, nor any capacity to use the gifts of the spirit and therefore evident it is that this promise of the Spirit belongs not to Infants at all*] And for the Allegation of St. Paul, that Infants are holy if their Parents be faithful, it signifie nothing, but
that they are holy by designation, — [*or according to Erasmus they (to wit Infants born of such Parents as the one being a Christian the other not*] (Erasmus. Paraphrase on 1 Corinthians 7) *are holy legitimately, for the conversion of either wife or husband doth not dissolve the marriage which was made when both were in unbelief. And however it is true, that Austin was a great sticker for Paedo-Baptism, yet he denies that any such thing can be deduced from the text in hand, his words are these,* St. Augustine. On the Merits and Forgiveness of Sins *It is to be held without doubting, whatsoever that sanctification was, it was not of power to make Christians and remit sins. He might well say so considering that the holiness of the child is derived from the sanctity of the unbeliever, as the word else being rightly referred doth evince, 1 Corinthians. 7:14.*]

And as the promise appertains not (for ought appears) to Infants in that capacity and consistance, — yet Baptism is not the means of conveying the holy Ghost, for that which *Peter says be baptized and ye shall receive the holy Ghost,* signifies no more then this, first be baptized and then by imposition of the Apostles hands, (which was another mystery and rite) ye shall receive the promise of the Father and this is nothing but an insinuation of the rite of Confirmation, as to this sense expounded by divers antient Authors; and in ordinary Ministry, the effect of it is not bestowed upon any unbaptized persons, for it is in order next after baptism: and upon this ground Peters argument in the case of Cornelius was concluding enough, *a majori ad minus,* thus the holy Ghost was bestowed upon him and his Family, which gift by ordinary ministry was consequent to baptism, not as the effect is to the cause, or to the proper instrument, but as a consequent is to an antecedent, in a chain of causes accidentally, and by positive institution depending upon each other) God by that miracle did give Testimony that the persons of the men were in great dispositions towards Heaven, and therefore were to be admitted to these rites which are the ordinary inlets into the kingdome of Heaven. But then from hence to

argue that where ever there is a capacity of receiving the same grace, there also the same sign is to be administered, and from hence to infer Paedo-Bapism, is an argument very fallatious upon several grounds; first because Baptism is not the sign of the holy Ghost, but by another mystery it was conveyed ordinarily, and extraordinarily, it was conveyed independently from any mystery, and so the argument goes upon a wrong supposition. If the supposition were true, yet the proposition built upon it is false, for they that are capable of the same grace, are not always capable of the same sign, for women under the law of *Moses* although they were capable of the righteousness of Faith, yet they were not capable of the sign of Circumcision, for God does not always conveys his graces in the same manner, but to some mediately, to some immediately; and there is no better instance in the the World of it, then the gift of the holy Ghost (which is the thing now instanced in, in this contestation.)

And after all this least these arguments should not ascertain their cause, they fall on complaining against God, and will not be content with God, unless they may baptize their children but take exceptions that God did more for the children of the Jews. But why so? because God made a Covenant with their children actually as Infants, and concin'd it by circumcision: well so he did with our children too in their proportion. He made a Covenant of spiritual promises on his part, and spiritual and real services on ours; and this pertains to children when capable, but made with them as soon as they are alive, and yet not so as with the Jews babes, for as they rite consign'd them actually, so it was a national and temporal blessing and covenant, and a separation of them from the portion of the Nations, a marking them for a peculiar people, and therefore while they were in the Wilderness and separate from the commixture of all people they were not at all circumcised but as that rite did seal the righteousness of Faith, [*Which whether it did any such thing to any save to Abraham only, is much doubted*] so by virtue of its adherence, and permanency in their flesh, it did that work when the children came to age, But in Christian Infants the case is otherwise, for the new Covenant being established upon better promises, is not only to be ter purposes, but also in a distinct manner to be understood, when their spirits are as receptive of a spiritual act or impress as the bodies of jewish children were of the sign of circumcision then it is to be consign'd; but the business is quickly at an end by saying that God hath done no less for ours, then for their children, for he will do the mercies of a Father and Creator to them; and he did no more to the other, but he hath done more to ours, for he hath made a Covenant with them and built it upon promises of the greatest concernment. [*And note further we have as much ground of comfort concerning our dying Infants, as the faithful had for the first two thousand*

years, during all which time, the Covenant of grace reached to Infants, though there was no external ceremony to consign it to Infants.]

For the insinuation of the precept of Baptizing all Nation, of which children are a part, does as little advantage as any of the rest, because other parallel expressions of the Scripture do determine and expound themselves to a sense that includes not all persons absolutely, but of a capable condition as *adorae eum omnes gentes, or persalliat Deo omnes Nationes terrae.* [And Nation shall rise against Nation, where Infants are excluded] and divers more. But *Erasmus* (Erasmus. Paraphrase on Matthew 28) hath well expounded *this text, where he restrains the baptizing to such as are repentant of their former life.*

As for the Conjecture concerning the Family of *Stephen's,* at the best it is but a conjecture, and besides that it is not prov'd that there were children in the Family; yet if that were granted it follows not that they were baptized, because by [whole Families] in Scripture is meant all Persons of reason and age within the Family: for it is said of the Ruler at Capernaum naum, that he believed and all his house. Now you may also suppose that in his house were little babes, that is like enough, and you may suppose that they did believe too, before they could understand, but that's not so likely; and then the argument from baptizing *Stephen's* Family may be allowed just as probable: but this is unmanlike to build upon such slight and airy conjectures.

But tradition by all means must supply the place of Scripture, and there is pretended a Tradition apostolical that Infants were baptized: but at this we are not much moved, for we who rely upon the written word of God, as sufficient to establish all true Religion, do not value the allegations of Traditions; and however the World goes none of the reformed Churches can pretend this argument against this opinion, because they who reject Tradition when 'tis against them, must not pretend it at all for them. But if we should allow the Topic to be good, yet how will it be verified? For so far as I can yet appear, it relies wholly upon the Testimony of Origen; for from him *Austin* had it. Now a Tradition apostolical if it be not consigned with a fuller testimony then of one person, whom all after ages have condemn'd of many errours, will obtain so little reputation among those that knew that things have upon greater authority pretended to derive from the Apostles, and yet if by that it will be a great argument that he is credulous and weak, that shall be determined by so weak probation, in matters of so great concernment.

And the truth of the business is, as there was no command of Scripture to oblige children to the susception of it, so necessity of Paedo-baptism was not determined in the Church till the eight age after Christ, but in the year 418, in the *Milevitan council* (a province of Africa) there was a Canon made for *Paedo-Bapt.* never till then, I grant it was practised in Africa before that time; and they or some of them thought well of it,

and though that be no Argument for us to think so, yet none of them did ever before pretend it to be necessary, none to have been a precept of the Gospel, St. *Austin* was the first that ever preached it to be absolutely necessary, and it was in his heat and anger against *Pelagius* who had warmed and chafed him in that question; that it made him innovate in other doctrines, possibly of greater concernment than this. And that although this was practis'd antiently in Africa yet that it was without an opinion of necessity, and not often there, nor at all in other places, we have the testimony of a learned Paedo Baptist Ludovicus Vives, who in his annotations upon (Augustine. The City of God, Chapter 27). affirms, *Neminem nisi adultum antiquitus solere baptizari.* [And became the Testimony is of great import I will set down the very words of Augustine and Ludovicus Vives, as I find them in the English Edition of the said book of the City of God. Chapter 26. Where Augustine puts forth this question. *What is the reason then that we do spend so much time in our exhortations, endeavouring to animate those whom we have baptized, either unto Virginity, or chast widow-hood or honest and honourable marriage; Now upon these words [those whom we have baptized] Vives comments th us. Least any man should mistake this place, understand that in times of old, no man was brought unto baptism, but he was of sufficient years, to know what that mystical water meant, and to require his baptism, and that sundry times.— I hear that in some Cities of Italy they do for the most part observe the ancient Customs as yet.* And it is to be observed that in the Margent are two Notes, the

1. is that this is the old manner of baptizing.

2. That all this is left out in the Paris Edition, whence we may note how the writings of the Antients are abused, and how ingeniously it is confessed, paedo-Baptism is not the old manner of baptizing.

And here we will insert some other testimonies from the learned Paedo-Baptists, touching the Novelty of Infant baptism. The first is out of (*Robertus Fabianus*. The New Chronicles of England and France. Book IV, page 107) where he brings in Augustine the Monk speaking thus to the Britain Bishops, *Since ye will not assent to my Hefts generally assent ye to me specially in three things, the first is that ye keep Easter-day in due form and time as it is ordained. The second,* THAT YE GIVE CHRISTENDOM TO CHILDREN, &c. But THEY WOULD NOT THEREOF. This was about the fifth Age after Christ whence its remarkable that Infant baptism was then opposed by the joint consent of the Britain Bishops which were sent to the Assembly to confute the affairs of Religion at that time. Our next testimony is from the Learned Casuist Hugo Grotius who tells us, To defer baptism till ripe years was in old time left at liberty, now the observation is

otherwise. Plainly giving the case that Paedo-baptism is not the old way but a new observation, But here we will again give place to Doctor Taylor, who saith.

"That besides that the tradition cannot be proved to be Apostolic, we have very good evidence from antiquity that it was the opinion of "the primitive Church that INFANTS OUGHT NOT TO BE BAPTIZED. And this is clear in the fifth Canon of the Council of Neocaesarea. The words have this sense. A woman with child may περὶ κυοφόρης ὅτι δεῖ φωτίζεσθαι ὁπότε θ᾽ ἕλει οὐδὲν γὸ κοινωνεῖ ἡ τικτουσατῶ τικτομένῳ. διὰ τὼ ἑκάστου ἰδιὰν τὴν προαίρεσιν τὴν ἐν τῇ ὁμολογίᾳ δείκνυσθαι. be baptized when she pleases; for her baptism concerns not the Child. The reason of the connection of the parts of that Cannon is in the following words. *Because every one in that confession is to give a demonstration of his own choice and election,* meaning plainly, that if the baptism of the mother did pass upon the Child, it were not fit for a pregnant woman to receive baptism, because in that Sacrament, there being a confession of faith which confession supposes understanding, and free choice, it is not reasonable the child should be consigned with such a mystery, since it cannot do any act of choice or understanding. The Canon speaks reason, and it intimates a practice which was absolutely universal in the Church of interrogating the catechumens concerning the Articles of the Creed, which is one argument that either they did not admit Infants to baptism, or that they did prevaricate egregiously, in asking questions of them, who themselves could not give an answer."

And to supply their incapacity by the answer of a Godfather, is but the same unreasonableness acted with a worse circumstance; and there is no sensible account can be given of it(*Tertullian. On Baptism, Chapter 18*) for that which some imperfectly murmur concerning stipulations civil performed by tutors in the name of their pupils is an absolute vanity; for what if by positive constitutions of the *Romanes* such solemnities of Law are required in all stipulations, and by indulgence are permitted in the case of a notable benefit accruing to Minors. Must God be tyed, and Christian Religion transact her mysteries by proportion and compliance with the Law of the Romanes? I know God might if he would have appointed Godfathers to give answer in behalf of Children, and to be Fide-jussors for them, but we can not find any authority or ground that he hath, and if he had, then it is to be supposed he would have given them commission to have translated the solemnity with better circumstances, and given answers with more truth, and if the Godfathers answer in the Name of the Child [*I do believe*] it is notorious they speak false and ridiculously: for the Infant is not capable of believing; and if he were, he were also capable of dissenting, and how then do they know his mind? And therefore *Tertullian* gives advice that the baptism of Infants should be deferred till they could give an account of their faith(*Tertullian. On Baptism, Chapter 18*) and the same also is the

counsel of *Gregory* bishop of *Nazianzum,* although he allows them to hasten it in case of necessity(Gregory Nazianzen's. Oration on Holy Baptism) for though his reason taught him what was fit, [*Namely that none should be baptized till they were of understanding*] yet he was overborn with the practice and opinion of his Age, which began to bear too violently upon him, and yet in another place he makes mention of some to whom baptism was not administred *διὰ νηπιότητα* by reason of infancy.

To which if we add that the Parents of St. *Austin*, St. *Jerome,* and St. *Ambrose,* although they were Christian, yet did not baptize their Children before they were thirty years of age it will be very considerable in the example, and of great efficacy for destroying the supposed necessity or derivation from the Apostles. [*And for further evidence we may well allege in this place, that of Theodosius the Emperor born in Spain, his parents being both Christians, and he from his youth educated in the Christian Faith, who falling sick at Thessalonica, was baptized and recovered of his sickness.*]

But however (Paedo-baptism) it is against the perpetual analogy of Christs Doctrine to baptize Infants, for besides that Christ never gave any precept to baptize them, nor never himself nor his Apostles (that appears) did baptize any of them, all that either he or his Apostles said concerning baptism, requires such precious dispositions to it, of which Infants are not capable, and these are faith and repentance, and not to instance in those innumerable places that require faith before *baptism,* there needs no more but this one saying,

"*He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, but he that believeth not shall be damned*." (Mark. 16) Perseverance in Faith must here be understood, with the Fruits of Faith also. Plainly thus, faith and baptism in conjunction will bring a Man to Heaven, but if he have not faith baptism shall do him no good. So that if baptism be necessary, then so is faith, and much more; for want of Faith damns absolutely, it is not said so of the want of baptism.

Now if this decretory sentence be to be understood of persons of age; and if Children by such an answer (which indeed is reasonable enough) be excused from the necessity of Faith, the want of which regularly does damn, then it is sottish to say the same incapacity of reason and Faith, shall not excuse them from the actual susception of baptism which as is less necessary, and to which faith and many other acts are necessary predispositions when it is reasonably and humanely received. The conclusion is that baptism is also to be deferred till the time of Faith, and whether Infants have faith or no, is a question to be disputed by persons that care not how much they say, nor how little they prove.

1. Personal and actual faith they have none, for they have no acts of understanding, and besides how can any man understand that they have, since he never saw any sign of it, neither was he told so by any one that could tell.
2. Some say they have imputative Faith, but then so let the Sacrament be too, that is, if they have the Parents faith or the Churches, then so let baptism be imputed by derivation from them also. — For since faith is necessary to the susception of baptism (and they themselves confess it by striving to find out new kinds of faith to daub the matter up) such as the faith is, such must be the Sacrament, for there is no proportion between an actual Sacrament and an imputative faith; this being an immediate and necessary order to that, and whatsoever can be said to take off from the necessity of actual Faith, all that and much more may be said to excuse from the actual susception of baptism.
3. The first of these devices was that of Luther and his Scholars, the 2 of Calvin and his; And yet there is a third device which the Church of Rome teaches, and that is, that Infants have habitual faith, but who told them so? How can they prove it? What *Revelation*, or reason teaches such a thing? Are they by this habit so much as disposed to an actual belief without a new Master? Can an infant sent into a *Mahometan* Province be more confident for Christianity when he comes to be a Man, then if he had not been baptized, are there any acts precedent Concomitant, or consequent to this pretended habit? This strange invention is absolutely without Art, without Scripture, Reason or Authority.

[*But if there were such a thing as this habitual Faith, then either all Infants have it or some only; if all why do they deny baptism to the Infants which are born of unbelievers? must the child bear the unbelief of the Parents?*

For they do not only deny such Infants the Act, but the right to baptism because the children of unbelievers only have it, how know they these from the rest, since when they come to years, there is found a like barrenness of this grace till means be used to beget it? but thirdly where does the Scripture make an habitual Faith that which intitles any person to baptism? Surely according to these conceits no man can ever tell to whom, or when to dispense baptism.] But the men are to be excused unless there were better grounds; but for all these stratagems the Argument now alleged against Infant baptism is demonstrable and unanswerable,

To which also this consideration may be added, that if baptism be necessary to the Salvation of Infants, upon whom is the imposition laid? To whom is the command given? To Parents or to the Children, not to the Children, for they are not capable of a Law; not to the parents, for then God hath put the salvation of innocent babies into the

power of others, and Infants may then be damn'd for their Parents carelessness or malice. It follows that it is not necessary at all to be done to them, to whom it cannot be prescribed by a Law, and in whose behalf it cannot be reasonably intrusted to others with the appendant necessity, and if it be not necessary, it is certain it is not reasonable, and most certain it is no where in terms prescribed, and therefore it is to be presumed, that it ought to be understood and administered according as other precepts are with reference to the capacity of the subject, and the reasonableness of the thing.

For I consider that the baptizing of Infants does rush upon such inconveniences, which in other questions we avoid like Rocks which will appear if we discourse thus.

Either baptism produces spiritual effects, or it produces them not: If it produces not any, why is such contention about it? — But if (as without all peradventure all the Paedo-baptists will say) Baptism does a work upon the soul, producing spiritual benefits and advantages; These advantages are produced by the external work of the Sacrament alone, or by that as it is helped by the co-operation and predispositions of the *suscipient.*

If by the external work of the Sacrament alone, how does this differ from the *opus operatum* of the *Papists*, save that it is worse? For they say the Sacrament does not produce its effect, but in a *suscipient* disposed by all requisites and due preparatives of piety, faith, and repentance, though in a subject so disposed they say the Sacrament by its own virtue does it, but this opinion says it does it of itself without the help, or so much as the coexistence of any condition but mere reception.

But if the Sacrament does not do its work alone, but *per modum recipientes* according to the predispositions of the suscipient, then because Infants can neither hinder it, nor do anything to further it, it does them no benefit at all. And if any man runs for succor to that, exploded *χρησμοὺς,* that Infants have faith or any other inspired habit of I know not what; how, we desire no more advantage in the world then that they are constrained to an answer without *Revelation*, against reason, common sense and all experience in the world.

The sum of the argument in short, is this though under another representation. Either baptism is a meer Ceremony or it imposes a duty on our part, if it be a Ceremony only, how does it sanctify us or *make the comers thereunto perfect*? If it implies a duty on our part how then can children receive it who cannot do duty at all.

And indeed this way of Ministration makes baptism to be wholly an outward duty, a work of the Law, a carnal ordinance it makes us adhere to the Letter, without regard of the spirit, to be satisfied with the shadows, to return to bondage. To relinquish the mysteriousness, the substance and spirituality of the Gospel, which argument is of so much the more consequence, because under the spiritual Covenant, or the Gospel of

grace, if the mystery goes not before the Symbol (which it does when the Symbols are scales and consignations of the Grace, as it is said the Sacraments are) yet it always accompanies it, but never follows in order of time, and this is clear in the perpetual analogy of holy Scripture.

For baptism is never propounded, mentioned or enjoyed as a means of remission of sins, or of eternal life, but something of duty, choice or sincerity is joined with it, in order to production of the end so mentioned. "*Know ye not that so many as are baptized into Jesus Christ are baptized into his death*?" (Romans. 6:3) There is the mystery and the Symbol together and declared to be perpetually united *δοσι Βεβηθυμεν*. All of us who were Baptised into one, were Baptised into the other, not only in the name of Christ, but into his death also; but the meaning of this, as it is explained in the following words of St. *Paul*, makes enough for our purpose: for to be baptized into his death, signifies, *to be buried with him in Baptisme, that as Christ rose from the dead; we also should walk in newness of life.* (Romans 6:4) That's the full mystery of Baptism, for being baptised into his death, or which is all one in the next words, ἐν ὁμοιώματι τοῦ θανάτου αὐτοῦ to the likeness of his death, cannot go alone; *if we be so planted into Christ we shall be partakers of his resurrection*, and that is not here instanced in precise reward but in exact duty; for all this is nothing but *Crucifixion of the old man, a destroying the body of sin, that we no longer serve sin*.

This indeed is truly to be baptized both in the Symbol and the Mystery; what is less than this, is but the Symbol only, a meer Ceremony, an *opus operatum*, a dead Letter, an empty shadow, an instrument, without an agent to manage or force to actuate it.

Plainer yet *whosoever are baptized into Christ have put on Christ, have put on the new Man.* But to put on the new Man, is to *be formed in Righteousness, holiness, and truth.* This whole argument is the very words of St. Paul. The major proposition is dogmatically determined, (Galatians. 3:27) The minor in (Ephesians. 4:24) The conclusion then is obvious. That they who are not formed anew in Righteousness, holiness and truth, they who remaining in the present incapacities, cannot walk in newness of life, they have not been baptized into Christ, and then they have but one member of the distinction used by St. Peter, they have that baptism which is a putting away the filth of the flesh [*If yet an human institute may be so called*] but they have not that baptism which is the answer of a good Conscience towards God, which is the only baptism which saves us, and this is the case of Children and then the case is thus.

As Infants by the force of nature cannot put themselves into a supernatural condition, and therefore says the Paedo baptists they need baptism to put them into it [*as if the bare ceremony of which only they are capable could put them into a supernatural condition*] so if

they be baptized before the use of reason, *before the works of the Spirit,* before the operations of grace, before they can throw off the works of darkness, and live in righteousness and newness of life, they are never the nearer; from the pains of Hell they shall be saved by the mercy of God and their own innocence though they dye in puris naturalibus, and baptism will carry them no further: for that baptism that saves us, is not the only washing with water, of which only Infants are capable, but the answer of a good Conscience towards God, which they are not capable till the use of reason, till they know to chuse the good and refuse the evil.

And from thence I consider a new thing, that all vows made by persons under others names, stipulations made by minors are not valid till they by a supervening act, after they are of sufficient age do ratifie the same, why then may not Infants as well make the *vow de novo as de novo ratifies* that which was made for them *ab antiquo* when they come to years of choice? If the Infant vow be invalid till the manly confirmation, why were it not as good they stayed to make it till that time, before which if they do make it, it is to no purpose, this would be considered.

And in conclusion our way is the surer way, for not to baptise Children till they can give an account of their faith is the most proportionable to an act of reason and humanity, and it can have no danger in it: for to say that Infants may be damn'd for want of baptism (a thing which is not in their power to acquire, they being yet persons not capable of a Law) is to affirm that of God which we dare not say of any wise and good man. Certainly it is very much derogatory to God's justice and a plain defiance to the infinite reputation of his goodness.

And therefore whoever will pertinaciously persist in this opinion of the paedo-baptists, and practise it accordingly they pollute the blood of the everlasting Testament, dishonor and make a pageantry of the Sacrament. They signified only a sepulture into the death of Christ, and pleased themselves in a sign without effect, making baptism like the Figtree full of Leaves but no fruit, &c.

Thus far the *Anabaptists* may argue, and men have disputed against them with so much weakness and confidence, that they have been encouraged in their error [*alias in the truth*] more by accidental [*alias rea*l] advantages we have given them by our weak arguing, then by any truth of their cause or excellency of their wit [*So the Dr. is pleased to say but the evidence of our side speaks otherwise*] but the use I make of it as to our present question (saith the Dr.) is this, that since there is no direct impiety in the opinion nor any that is apparently consequent to it, and they which so much probability do or may pretend to true persuasion, they are with all means, Christian, fair, and human, to be redargued, or instructed, but if they cannot be persuaded they must be left to God,

who knows every degree of every man's understanding. all his weakness's and strength's what impress each argument makes upon his spirit, and how unresistable every reason is, and he alone judges his innocency and sincerity: And for the question, I think there is so much to be pretended *[he might say really urged*] against that which I believe to be truth that there is much more truth then evidence on our side. [*A strange saying of so wise a man as if the truth in this case doth not wholly depend upon evidence, sith it is a positive and no moral precept:*] and therefore we may be confident as for our own particulars but not too forward premorily to prescribe to others much less damn, or kill or to persecute them that only in this particular disagree. Thus far Doctor Taylor, for our apology.

To whom to add any more witnesses (though more might be brought) would be superfluous. I therefore proceed to the next question, viz.

What is the due act, or outward form to be used in this solemn rite of holy baptism?

It may well be the admiration of every wise and good man how it should come into the mind of such as pretend to be followers of Christ that holy baptism should be performed by aspersion, or casting a few drops of Water upon the subject, by the fingers of the administrator. The scriptures every where teaching us that the original form was by immersion in Rivers or places of much Water, *Mark*,

1. *John 3.* Christ himself, who surely would do nothing superfluous or in vain, was baptized in the River, by John the first baptist, who had his direction from Heaven, and his approbation from on high in that very action, (Matthew. 3) and those who were under the immediate direction of the holy spirit, the leader into all truth, found it necessary for the administrator and subject to go both into the Water, for the due performance of this holy Ordinance. Add thereunto that the proper signification of the word Baptizo when used to express the action done

in this service, is to dip or immerse the party in the Element as is confessed by the learned Paedo-baptists themselves as we shall see in the sequel.

And here we will still prefer the Church (Liturgy) of England who teacheth us that the outward Sign or Form in baptism, is Water wherein the party baptized is dipped, &c. And though she add or sprinkled with it yet that her Conscience tells her that is not the right way appeareth, in that she only assigns that by indulgence to such Infants as are in danger of death, &c.

The Church of Rome also confesseth by a learned Pen (Henry Somerset. The Contest of Religion) that she changed dipping the party baptized over the head and Ears to a little sprinkling upon the Face.

Erasmus paraphrasing on the words, baptizing them, Mat. 28. saith thus, if they believe that which you teach them and begin to be repentant of their former Life, &c. Then dip

them in water, &c. Walafrid Strabo, De rebus ecclesiasticis. tells us, that we must know at the first believers were baptized simply in Floods and Fountains.

The learned Grotius tells us in his judgement on Infant baptism, That the word Baptize signifies to dip over the head and ears.

To whom we will join Tilenus whose Testimony is in these words (According to Fisher) Baptism is the first Sacrament of the New Testament instituted by Christ; in which with a most pat and ex analogie between the sign and the thing signified, those that are in Covenant are by the Minister washed in Water. The outward Rite in baptism is threefold immersion into the Water, abiding under the water, and resurrection out of the water, the form of baptism, to wit internal and essential, is no other than that analogical proportion, which the signs keep with the things signified; thereby, for as the properties of the water in washing away the defilements of the body, do in a most suitable similitude, set forth the efficacy of Christ's blood in blotting out of sins, so dipping into the Water doth in a Most lively similitude set forth the mortification of the old man, and rising out of the water the vivification of the new. That same plunging into the water holds forth to us that horrible gulf of divine Justice in which Christ for our sins-sake, which he took upon him, was for a while in a manner swallowed up. Abode under the water how little a while soever, denotes his descent into Hell, even the very deepest degree of lifelessness, while lying in the sealed and guarded sepulchre he was accounted as one truly dead, rising out of the water holds out to us a lively similitude of that conquest, which this dead man got over death, which he vanquished in his own Den, as it were, that is the grave. In like manner therefore it is meet that we being baptized into his death, and buried with him, should rise also with him and so go on in a new Life, (*Romans. 6:3-4, Colossians. 2:12*) *Thus far Tilenus*.

Bishop Jewell in his defence, Apology. Chapter 5, Page 308. brings the counsel of Worms determining the manner of baptism; thus, *In aquas demersio in infernum est, & cujus ab aquis emersio Resurrectio est*.

The dipping into the water is the going down into Hell [i. e. the grave] The coming out from of the water is the Resurrection. *From all which Testimonies (and many more that might be brought) it is evident beyond all doubt our opposers being Judges) that whether we respect the signification of the word baptize: or the signification of the ordinance itself, or the consent of the primitive Churches in their practice of holy baptism, dipping the subject (or party baptized) in the Element Water, is the due form of baptism, and therefore sprinkling or crossing the face, is an humane innovation. Or,*

Upon the whole matter these ten particulars are very apparent. First,

That Infant baptism was innovated, after the holy Scriptures were written which appeareth both from the deep silence of the Scripture in that case, and the confession of learned Paedo-baptists themselves.

2. That it came in stealing (as it were) being for a considerable time left at liberty (a sign it was not from Heaven) (*for God's ways are so to be left to mens will be commands, and its mans duty to obey*) and was disliked by the Ancients who therefore disowned it.
3. That which gave it its great advantage for a more general reception, was this false opinion, that without baptism none could be saved. This false faith Mr. *Perkins* doth St. *Augustine* everywhere affirmed.
4. That the Lord's Supper was as eagerly pressed, to be necessary for Infants as baptism, and they continued in use together about the space of fix hundred years, this conceit was confirmed saith Mr. Perkins (William Perkins. See the Scholastic discourse against Symbol with Antichrist.) by the Council of Toledo. Canon 11. And Augustine was so earnest for this also that he boldly sayes in vain do we promise Infants salvation without it. Augustine. Epistle 23, & Epistle 107, & Against Two Letters of the Pelagians. Book 1, Chapter 22, & Against Julian. Book 3, Chapter 12 & Book 7, Chapter 2.
5. That divers in the Greek Church have all along to this day refused Infant baptism. Grotius his words are these (as Mr. Timbs quotes them) In every age many of the Greeks unto this day keep the custom of deferring baptism to little ones till they could themselves make a confession of their Faith. And the *Armenians* are confessed by Heylin in his *Macrocos.* Page, 575. To defer baptism to their Children till they be grown to years of knowledge.
6. Those foolish and sinful adjuncts, which the Authors and promoters of Infant baptism were constrained to invent to make it look like baptism (for example their device of Godfathers, &c.) do sufficiently declare it to be of an infirm and humane Original.
7. The grounds upon which Pædobaptism was at first urged, are now in a manner wholly declined, and new grounds daily invented whereon to build it, which are no sooner laid, but razed again by some of its own favorites.
8. That the stoutest assertors of Infant baptism, hath ever met with as stout opposers; Thus *Augustine*, met with the *Donatists*, and *Pelagius* whose arguments he could not avoid but by running into greater absurdity, and though they are

blamed (and perhaps justly) for holding some errours, so also is *Augustine* and that not undeservedly.

9. That many of the Learned have much abused this age in telling them the *Anabaptists* (i.e. the Baptized Churches) are of late edition a new sect, &c. When from their own writings the clean contrary is so evident.

Tenthly and Lastly. Observe how the baptism of repentance for remission of Sins, which is that one and only baptism commanded in holy Scripture hath been neglected, traduced; and its assertors frequently abused, and that chiefly by this device of Pædo-baptism which now hath so lost its first serum, that it cannot with any shew of truth or good sense be called baptism, and ought therefore to cease with its fellow errors, viz. the giving the Lord's Supper to Infants, &c. That God may be justified in the submission of all sinners to the baptism of repentance for remission of sins, (Luke. 7:39)

The Second Part
Of the Promises of the Spirit

Delivered in a Sermon Upon
1 Corinthians. 12:1
To Which is Added
A Postscript out of the works of Dr. Jeremy Taylor, touching the laying on of Hands, chiefly declaring how Religiously it was observed by the Ancient Christian, as it is now revived by divers of the baptized Christian of this age.

1 Corinthians. 12:1

Now concerning spiritual gifts, brethren, I would not have you ignorant.

There was never more need for the Church of God to seek and search for all those things which God hath promised for her strength and encouragement then now partly for that her opposers are men of exquisite parts by means of all Arts and Sciences which are not more profitable when used in a way of subserviency to the truth, then pernicious when used in opposition to it (as it often falleth out they are) and partly for that ignorance of what God hath promised for his Churches comfortable subsistence, proves a great occasion and temptation to Christians to trust to failing and uncomfortable helps in the great business of the Ministry of the word and prayer, &c.

Now in the words which we have chosen the Apostle shews his care for the Church at Corinthus (and in them for all Churches) that they should not be ignorant concerning spiritual gifts and labours in three Chapters together to instruct them fully in that point under several considerations; and first,

1. *By giving them a definition of those gifts,* or shewing what they are, *verse* 8, 9, 10. *viz*. A word of Wisdom, a word of knowledge, faith, the gifts of healing, the working of miracles, prophesies, discerning of spirits, divers kinds of Tongues, interpretation of tongues, which definition or enumeration of gifts he seems to enlarge, Chapter 13:26. a Psalm, a Doctrine, &c.

2. *By shewing that the Church hath a perpetual right to, and interest in all these gifts,* Chapter 14:1. Desire or be zealous after spiritual gifts, Chapter 12:31. Covet earnestly the best gifts. Chapter 14:39. Covet to prophesy and forbid not to speak with tongues.
3. *By shewing whereto these gifts do serve, or to what end they were given.* Chapter 14:12. Forasmuch as ye are zealous of the spiritual gifts, seek that ye may excel to the edification of the Church, verse 31. that all may learn, and all be comforted, Ephesians. 4:12. for the perfecting the Saints for the work of the Ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ.
4. *By distinguishing gifts as they are more or less necessary and accordingly gives direction which to prefer in our asking them* (yet so as not to forbid the use of any of them, so it might be done with edification) Chapter 14:1. *Desire spiritual gifts but rather that ye may prophesy*. Verse 5. *I would have you all speak with tongues but rather that ye prophesied, for greater is he that prophesieth then he that speaketh with tongues. Verse 40. He that speaketh in an unknown tongue edifyeth himself, but he that prophesieth edifyeth the Church.*
5. *By shewing that all these gifts, how excellently soever any are endowed with them, yet herein he is not to rest satisfied because there is yet a far more excellent way of receiving the Spirit,* without which all gifts are as nothing. This more excellent way he refers to the fruit of the Spirit, which he both distinguisheth by its several branches, 1 Corinthians. 13:4-7. compared with Galatians 5:22-23. and also comprehends the whole in that excelling grace of Charity follow after Charity, Chapter 4:1. The greatest of these is Charity.
6. By giving a notable Rule to know who are indeed spiritual Christians from such as only pretend to be so; Chapter 14:35. If any man think himself to be a Prophet or Spiritual, let him acknowledge the things I write unto you are the commandments of the Lord. Those then are not truly spiritual, or true Prophets who (as many on the right hand) do not only lay aside the commands of the Lord, but prescribe to others their own Traditions; neither those on the other hand, who prefer their poor conceits and Notions, as if the word of God came out from to them, when though (perhaps) it came to them, yet it came not to them only, verse 36.

   Thus much briefly to shew what the Apostle means in this place by spiritual gifts, and in what respects he would not have the Church to be ignorant concerning them.

Nor shall I insist upon all those particulars now, but only that which may be most needful to be demonstrated, and that is the second particular. For I find, it is not only a general conceit among the National Churches, that the extraordinary gifts of the Spirit were only Temporary, and now ceased, but also very many in the baptized Churches are doubtful (at the least) in this matter, as if that glorious promise of pouring out of the Spirit according to the prophecies of Joel, and the reception thereof by the primitive Churches, were taken away long since from the Churches which succeed them, and not to be so much as looked for in these days!

But that this is a very great mistake, and that the contrary, even that, viz. that every promise of the Spirit and every part of it, from the time of its first effusion upon the day of Pentecost, Acts 2. belongs to the Church throughout all Ages to the end of the World. I hope to evince to the satisfaction such as desire to see the Truth in this matter.

1. (From the Apostles Scope) And First from the scope of the Apostle, in these three Chapters. Whereas it is his designed subject to discourse of the gifts of the Spirit, so he informs us that God hath set them there, namely in his Church, that is, he hath placed, settled or fixed, that one spirit in that one body, nor for a few days only, and then to leave her as a body without a spirit for ever after; in respect of spiritual gifts, but to abide there as in his temple (1 Corinthians 3:16, 2 Corinthians 6:16) both by gifts and graces, even the same which Christ by virtue of his Ascension obtained when he ascended on high, which gifts are given to the Church for the work of the Ministry, for the edification of the body till the whole be completed. See to this purpose Ephesians 4:4-16.
2. (From the Extent of the Promises) Again, The promise of the holy spirit is made by our Lord himself to the Church for ever, John 14:16. I will pray the Father and he shall give you another Comforter that he may abide with you for ever &c. I say with the Church, for it were a strange exposition to restrain this for ever to the age of the Apostles (as some do) for till the Apostles and first Churches could neither pray nor prophesy as they ought, but as that spirit did help their infirmity, it were strange the subsequent should be able to do it though destitute of that assistance, seeing prophecy is expressly one of those spiritual gifts, as before we have shewed.

   That great Apostle Peter, dates the promise of the holy spirit very largely, Acts 2:38 &c. As descending to the very Skirt, or last age of the Church of God, even to as many as the Lord our God shall call, and he here takes the promise in that sense wherein *Joel* meant it, and the Church had then received it, by which clearly

intends both the gifts and graces of the Spirit, for as 'tis sure they received then very great gifts, so 'tis said great grace was upon them all. *Acts*. This very promise of the Father is by this Apostle appropriated to all the called of the Lord, even the servants and handmaids *in these days*.

Now these days must either be a few days at the beginning of the Gospel, or it must be referred to the whole time of that glorious dispensation; if the first, then how shall all the called of the Lord receive it? Or who will tell us when *these days* expired? But we know that these days, the latter days, last time, and last days are used with some frequency in Scripture, to point out the time of the Gospel as it succeeded the time of the Law.

3. (From the Nature of the duties of the Church) During all which time we are sure that the duties in general (and perhaps some difficult duties which were not formerly known) which were imposed upon the first Churches, are laid upon the Churches to the end of the World, Matthew 28:20. *Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you, &c*.

Must the Churches now contend earnestly for the faith (and that both against old and new errors) must she be the Salt of the Earth, the Light of the World, must she strive to preach the Gospel of the Kingdom to all Nations, must she keep herself in the Love of God building up herself in her most holy faith, praying in the Holy Ghost? Surely, if these duties remain, and the Lord requires that she should glorify him in the faithful and constant discharge hereof as also in suffering for his sake; It cannot reasonably be imagined that he should recall his holy spirit, *in the gifts* thereof from her who when she had them all, had nothing that was superfluous, but stood in need of all to furnish her for the work she stood engaged to do, in these forementioned and other like considerations, sith then our God doth require the same service of his Churches now, which he required of his Churches in the first ages of the Gospel, let us not imagine he will require the same Brick, and not allow the same Straw.

4. (From the nature and perpetuity of the exhortations to seek for the spirit) That the gifts of the spirit here intended by our Apostle are the portion of the Church in every age (as her right) appeareth, from the nature of these exhortations she is under to ask them. Luke 11:13. *How much more shall your heavenly Father give his holy spirit to them that ask it—ask and it shall be given unto you,* verse 10. How frequent is our Apostle in these 3 chapters in his exhortations to this Church (and in them to all others) to desire spiritual gifts, to covet earnestly the best gifts, to

covet to prophesy, willing that they may speak with tongues, and warning them not to prohibit that gift. Now to what purpose is all this if these gifts be ceased and that the Church may not now expect them? I hope no man will say these exhortations are now out of date lest in so doing he deprive us of the exhortation to Charity; for they are so linked together as the one cannot cease (as 'tis an exhortation) before the other. *Follow after Charity and desire spiritual gifts and rather that ye may prophesy*. Thus we see the Church being under perpetual exhortations, to seek for spiritual gifts without any restriction, necessarily interest her perpetual right to them and every of them, which consideration alone is sufficient (as I conceive, to satisfy any Christian, that the promise of the Spirit even the same that was given to the first Churches) in respect of gifts as well as graces belongs to the Church of Christ throughout all ages.

5. (From the continuation of Spiritual gifts in the Church to this day) Let us now consider, whether the Church of God do not even now enjoy the promised spirit in the gifts and graces of it at this day, for the latter, I think there is none doth question it, and yet should the graces or fruits of the spirit which now appear, be strictly considered by what did formerly shine forth in the Churches, it might peradventure put us to some pause, yet not thence to conclude that we have not that spirit of grace, or that the graces thereof are ceased, but it would surely become a provocation, to cry mightily to God for an enlargement of what we have received in that behalf.

   And as I intend not to boast of the gifts of any, so I may safely presume that the gifts received in these days are far more than I can set down, or give you account of, because the Church is diffused through many Nations, and her gifts there unknown to me; I will then restrain my observations to the Churches in this poor Island, who may not vie with all Churches, but rather in humility conclude themselves to be short of many concerning spiritual gifts. And yet, shall we say she hath none (or may we not rather say she hath many that are endowed with *a word of knowledge* and that merely by a gift from God, having otherwise, no capacity or faculty more than others, but therein far short of many of their brethren; only the gift of God, and no natural faculty hath made the differance: How have men of knowledge in this world, been found to have no skill, and the foolish to attain knowledge, and some to excel so far, as to confound the wisdom of the wise and to bring to nought the understanding of the prudent, yet out of the mouth of Babes hath our God ordained strength, and thereby hath sometimes stilled the enemy.

And as *Wisdom* is useful to direct, so hath God given it to such as fear him; who if we respect their education &c. could never have acquired it; some by a word of wisdom here understand, the well ordering of affaires in the Church, others the right or useful application of the word &c, surely according to these expositions the Church hath some, even by the gift of the spirit of God to go before here in these respects.

Neither is the gift of *Healings* so abnegated, but that something of it hath appeared, as many living witness by experience have testified, and how far faith (over and beside the common faith) hath therein appeared, as also in some other memorable undertakings against Sathan himself, or against his designs, with some good success, becomes others to consider more than it doth me to write! As for me I rest satisfied, that *miracles* are not ceased as a gift to the Church of God, though perhaps they are but rarely found, as being (in the wisdom of God) not so necessary now in many places as in times past.

Now for the gift of *prophecy*, which the Apostle here intends, 'tis certain the Church enjoys it very graciously in these days sith she hath them that by the gift of God's spirit (and not by acquired Arts) do minister to her the word of life, by exhortation, to her edification and comfort; which yet she could not have if the gifts were ceased seeing prophecy is not only one of the spiritual gifts but the very best of them, and the greatest of them all.

Nor is the spirit of our God removed in the gift of *discerning of spirits*; for if it had false spirits had by their subtilty ere this day made havock of the Churches, but through the grace of God, notwithstanding all their cunning craftiness they have been discerned, and their designs prevented; and though perhaps charity for some time hath born with such, in hope of the best, yet this is no other thing then ought to be, as may be seen by the carriage of our Lord toward Judas, and his Apostles towards some others.

The gifts of *Doctrine* and praising our God with a *Psalm* is not yet removed, our Teachers (as taught of God) remaining in every Church; where also are some that are skillfully in praising the Lord to the edification of the Church;

As for *Revelations*, there might perhaps sometimes be strange or hidden things made known by some special gift of God and why may not God do such things now? However it is not unsafe to understand the *Revelations* here ment, by Chapter 14:30. *If any thing be revealed to another that sitteth by let the first hold his peace &c.* which cannot so well be understood of a new Oracle, as of some further subject, or more full explication of the matter treated on by him that spake first;

according to which interpretation we may say the Church hath yet the gift of Revelations. And thus far we seem to be got safe, not any thing so materially intervening, as to conclude against the continuance of these spiritual gifts in the Church to this day, so that the present *repairers* of the *House* or *City* of God may comfort themselves by the consideration of the words of the Prophet, Haggai 2:5. *According to the word which I covenanted with you when you came out of Egypt, so my* SPIRIT REMAINETH *among you, fear ye not*.

But now the gift of *Tongues* and *interpretation* of *Tongues*, these! where shall we find them? Doubtless these gifts are rarely if at all found in these days, and in this Nation, so as to suit with those who frequently in some Churches at first received those gifts; the reasons are many (but none such as conclude the Church from under the promise of these gifts) as first these gifts differ much from the rest, chiefly in this that they may be supply'd another way, for the conversion of persons of all Languages, or such as can speak other Languages and interpret the same to others, doth supply the absence of those gifts (*It is probable that Paul made use of his education in speaking divers Languages, as may be perceived by his discourses in the acts of the Apostles, and by the Epistles which he wrote to several Churches, using therein (as is confessed) frequently the Greek Tongue.*) The Churches (in this and I suppose other Nations) have very little need of these gifts, and therefore considering that they are not so necessary as the rest, the Apostle leaves these with *a forbid them not*, whilst the rest he wills us to *covet earnestly*. But 3? one great cause (as I conceive) why *these gifts* are so much absent, and *the other no more received*, is because we either ask them not at all, or else we ask them amiss. For many have been so far from asking these gifts of the Spirit, that in truth they have been arguing that these gifts *are not attainable*, and then it's no wonder they have not been received.

Again where there has been some understanding of the interest we have in those gifts, their faith in asking has been and is very low, and attended (perhaps) with great wavering, and then little can be expected at the hand of the Almighty, James 1. And here let me premonish you of one thing which (by my little reading) I perceive to have been a great provocation to the Lord to withdraw his gifts in times past (*and I fear it again*) And that was (and I doubt is) an *over curious performance*, of that which God gave spiritual gifts for, to wit the ministering of the word, when the Churches grew populous, and great personages came to her communion, the unwary pastors, let go the simplicity of the Gospel enclining so much to curiosities that some Counsells decreed that a Bishop should not read

Heathen Authors. and Gratian is said to have this passage viz. Doth not he seem to walk in vanity and darkness of mind, who vexes himself day and night in the studies of Logick, in the pursuit of physical speculations one while elevates himself above the highest Heavens and afterward throws himself below the nethermost part of the Earth. True, the use that may be made of reading is one thing, and the abuse another; however let the least gift of God be preferred in the ministry of the word, above the greatest of human Arts, otherwise we are in danger to incur the guilt of despising Prophesyings.

6. (From the silence of the Scriptures, as to the privation of the gifts of the Spirit &c.) Lastly the truth in hand appeareth from the silence of Scriptures, touching the privation of the gifts of the Spirit &c. privation of any of the gifts of the spirit till that which is perfect become, 1 Corinthians 13:8-9. *Charity never faileth but whether there be prophecies they shall fail, whether there be tongues they shall cease, whether there be knowledge it shall vanish away, for we know in part and we prophesy in part. But when that which is perfect is come THEN that which is in part shall be done away.*

Hence observe a final determination of the matter in question, If any ask when the gifts of prophecies, knowledge and tongues &c. Shall cease? The Apostles answer is, even THEN, when that which is perfect is come, or when we come to see face to face, or as we are seen. So then seeing the gifts of the spirit, do yet remain to the Church, and every of them (as her need requires) are attainable, it remains that we humbly consider our wants, and desire spiritual gifts, you covet earnestly the best gifts.

From these considerations I conclude, that howsoever it is too true that the gifts received by the present Churches are but low (and truly so are her graces) yet thence we may not, we ought not to infer, that the gifts promised are ceased, or that the Church hath now no interest therein. But contrarywise as the promise of gifts (as well as graces) pertains to us as we are the called of God, we ought to stir one another up (1 Corinthians 2:4) to seek with all diligence and full assurance for the spirit of promise, which being received, will abundantly supply our wants, help our infirmities, convince the contrary minded by its powerful evidence and demonstration in the ministry of the word and prayer.

There be two things objected against that which is said, the first.

Objection: If the promise of the spirit do thus belong to the Church, then this will follow, that the doctrines delivered by such gifted men must pass for Oracles of God being the effects of the spirit of truth whose properties it is to lead into all truth. And hence some have conceived the decrees of their Counsells to be infallible, and others

have given out of their private letters or books that they were as infallibly the word of God as the Scripture &c.

Answer: Those gifts do not argue the infallibility of him that hath them, for then all the gifted brethren at Corinth had been infallible which yet they were not, witness their great want of Wisdom how to use their gifts to edification, as also the Apostles referring what they delivered to Tryal, telling us of gifted person in general (and as such not excluding himself) that they see but darkly, prophesy but in part, know but in part, so that perfection herein is not to be pretended that the Apostles did deliver infallible and undoubted verities for all to submit to, as the very word of God &c. proceeded not hence, viz. because they were gifted men. But as being the chosen witnesses of God, purposely ordained to that very end, for which cause they saw that just one, heard the words of his mouth, and by infallible proves were assured of the Resurrection of our Lord and of his will concerning his Kingdom, John 15:16. *Ye have not chosen me, but I have chosen you and ordained you that you should go and bring forth fruit, and that your fruit should remain, that whatsoever ye shall ask the Father in my Name he may give it you,* see Acts 10:40-41. and Acts 22:14-15. *The God of our Fathers hath chosen thee that thou should know his will, and see that just one, and shouldest hear the voice of his mouth. FOR thou shalt be his witness unto all men of what thou hast SEEN AND HEARD.*

These are the Fathers of the Churches, the Foundation layers, the Master-builders in such an elevated consideration, as that the authority of one is to be valued above the authority of ten thousand subsequent teachers, which is a greater number then ever yet convened in a generall council, 1 Corinthians 4:15-16. These were such Fathers as laid up such a stock of doctrine for their Children, as whoso bringeth not along with them is not to be received. 2 John 8:9-10. And whosoever corrupteth by adding taking away or perverting is to be held accursed, to be nameless in the City of God and the book of Life, The conclusion is this, gifted persons, on whom the Holy Ghost fell as it did on the Apostles, were not thereby impowered, to propose new Oracles, or to be the Apostles Competitors, and if any presume to these things (as some did in the Apostles days) they shall fulfill that sentence, 2 Timothy 3:9. They shall proceed no further for their folly shall be made manifest to all men as theirs also was.

Objection: If the gifts of the spirit, 1 Corinthians 12. Have continued in the Church as you teach, 'tis strange we have no account of them since their days, unless we regard the papacy who have claimed the gift of Miracles in every age, which they urge as an undoubted proof that they only are the Church of Christ.

Answer: It is true that people do pretend, as 'tis said in the objection and it is now my business to examine the goodness of that pretence, only this I say they cannot find their

Church to have had a being in every age since Christ, and therefore very unlikely to prove what they say in the case of Miracles. But put case that since they have had a being in the world, some signs or wonders have been done among them, yet hence to infer the truth of their Church state is very unsafe, sith before an equal judge others will be found to have as clear a claim to Miracles as themselves. (Which yet shall avail them nothing, because they wanted truth with their gifts.) Matthew 7:22. *Many will say unto me in that day have we not prophesied in thy Name, and in thy name have we cast out Devils and in thy name have done many wondrous works. And then will I profess unto them I never knew you, depart from me ye workers of iniquity*,

And though our Saviour saith, no man can do a miracle in his Name and lightly speak evil of him, yet that very speech supposes the thing possible. It does not follow therefore that wheresoever miraculous gifts are there is the true Church, but she is only known by her Conformity to the Doctrine of God our Saviour, chiefly in the principles of Religion, Hebrews 6:1-2. For we are his House if built upon that foundation of Repentance, faith, &c. and partakers of him, IF we hold the beginning of our confidence steadfast to the end otherwise not. Hebrews 3:6-14. If any come unto you and bring not this doctrine receive him not to house, no, though he work miracles, for thus saith the Lord. *If there arise among you a Prophet or a Dreamer of Dreams, and giveth thee a sign or a wonder, and the sign or the wonder come to pass, whereof he spake unto thee [now note if he do this] saying let us go after other Gods (which thou hast not known) and let us serve them, thou shalt not hearken to the words of that Prophet — For the Lord your God proveth you to know whether you love the Lord your God, with all your heart, and with all your Soul*. And hence learn this one thing that God's Truth is not to give place to any gifts, but all gifts are to subserve to the furtherance of his Truth.

To conclude as we ought not to be ignorant of the gifts of the spirit, so neither of the means ordained of God to obtain those gifts. The primitive Churches are herein our best guide as the word directs. It is well known (and I think granted on all hands) that they used the solemn Ordinance of prayer and imposition of hands for obtaining the promised Spirit, at least with respect to these gifts. Now be it so (though I say for the Graces or Fruits also) then seeing these gifts are promised to us as well as unto them, and are attainable, and in part (at least) attained by many, what should hinder the Churches, but that now they should tread in this path, with faith and full assurance that a blessing is in it? As in holy baptism we are placed (as it were) among those whose sins are washed away in the blood of the Lamb. So in this Holy Ordinance of prayer and imposition of hands we are in a solemn manner ushered into the promise of the holy spirit, and as the pardon of our sins signified in baptism doth not prevent, but better capacitate us to pray

daily *forgive us our trespasses*, so imposition of hands doth put us into a better capacity to seek daily for the gifts and graces of the spirit, because now solemnly intercessed in the promise, by that very way the primitive Saints were intercessed therein, Act 8:15-17. Acts 19:2-6. 2 Timothy 1:6. Hebrews 6:12. *Who when they were down prayed for them that they might receive the Holy Ghost, then laid they their hands on them and they received the Holy Ghost*.

Have they received the Holy Ghost since they believed? And when Paul had laid his hand upon them, the Holy Ghost came on them.

Wherefore I put thee in remembrance that thou stir up the gift of God which is in thee by the putting on of my hands. The foundation of Repentance, and of faith towards God of the Doctrine of baptism and of laying on of hands, of the resurrection of the dead, and of Eternal Judgement.

What shall I say, the Scriptures are evidence sufficient that this Ordinance is of divine institution, is from Heaven; the promise which it leads to is perpetual, and Universal, it belongs to the whole body. *There is one body and one Spirit even as ye are called in one hope of your calling*.

Finished.